United Nations A/C.2/60/SR.37

General Assembly
Sixtieth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
26 January 2006

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 37th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 15 December 2005, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Koudelka (Vice-Chairman) ..... (Czech Republic)

Contents

Agenda item 50: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(b) International financial system and development (*continued*)

Agenda item 52: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (*continued*)

(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of mankind (*continued*)

(g) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (*continued*)

Agenda item 54: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(a) Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(c) International migration and development (*continued*)

Agenda item 55: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(a) Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (*continued*)

(b) Specific actions related to the particular needs and problems of landlocked developing countries: outcome of the International Ministerial Conference of Landlocked and Transit Developing Countries and Donor Countries and International Financial and Development Institutions on Transit Transport Cooperation (*continued*)

Agenda item 59: Towards global partnerships (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

05-64547 (E)

In the absence of Mr. Wali (Nigeria), Chairman, Mr. Koudelka (Czech Republic), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m.

Agenda item 50: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(b) International financial system and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.2 and A/C.2/60/L.67)

Draft resolutions on the international financial system and development

1. **The Chairman** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.67, which was being submitted by Mr. Hart (Barbados), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.2. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

2. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.67 was adopted.*

3. **Mr. Kariuki** (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of position on behalf of the European Union and those countries that had aligned themselves with the Union's position, said that outward investments from developing countries referred to in paragraph 5 were, in many cases, an indication of their integration into the world economy, and that those transfers frequently resulted from positive developments in their trade balances, thus allowing for debt repayments and the purchase of foreign assets. Those positive effects had been highlighted in previous resolutions and the European Union requested the Secretary-General to take them into account in future reporting, to be done in collaboration with the relevant institutional stakeholders.

4. With regard to paragraph 13 on risk-rating mechanisms, he stressed the importance of increasing transparency and competition in the private rating market, and of the need for capital markets to have widely accepted and comparable yardsticks in making investment decisions. The European Union had agreed to base the paragraph on paragraph 25 (d) of the World Summit Outcome, which should provide the framework for encouraging relevant developmental institutions to continue their work on that issue.

5. **Mr. Ceinos-Cox** (United States of America) supported the views expressed by the United Kingdom, on behalf of the European Union, with regard to risk-rating mechanisms (para. 13).

6. His delegation also wished to support and elaborate upon the Union's position with regard to paragraph 5 on net outflow of financial resources. A net outflow could be either favourable or unfavourable for a particular country, depending on the circumstances. In one case, it could reflect a country's successful export-led growth strategy; in another, it could reflect capital flight due to conflict or weak governance that undermined the confidence of domestic residents and potential foreign investors. A negative net outflow might be the result of an increase in exports, payment of debt servicing, or the accumulation of foreign reserves. Those were actions taken by all countries, developed and developing alike, on the basis of what they felt was in their national interest. They were also actions that international investors looked for when making financial decisions.

7. His delegation was concerned that the emphasis on net outflows was misleading, distracted attention from the most important development issues and implicitly criticized some of the very pro-growth policies that the United States had been working so hard to promote.

8. **Ms. Mills** (Jamaica), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, expressed satisfaction at the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus. The Group of 77 and China had listened with interest to the statements just made by the representative of the United Kingdom, on behalf of the European Union, and the representative of the United States of America. Paragraph 5 was of particular importance precisely because there could be a range of reasons for the net outflows experienced by developing countries over the past eight years, the effects of which could be very positive in certain specific cases, under very specific circumstances, but not in others. She hoped that further discussion of the issue would clarify its full implications.

9. **Mr. Hart** (Barbados), Vice-Chairman, expressed his and the Committee's good wishes to Ms. Grindlay (Australia), the facilitator of the draft resolution, who would be leaving the Second Committee, and thanked her for her hard work to achieve consensus not only on the draft resolution just adopted but also on every

major draft resolution and document adopted by the Second Committee in the past several years.

10. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.2 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 52: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (*continued*) (A/60/158)

11. **The Chairman** said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to take note of the report of the Secretary-General on actions taken in organizing the activities of the International Decade for Action, "Water for Life", 2005-2015 (A/60/158).

12. *It was so decided.*

(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of mankind (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.23/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on the protection of global climate for present and future generations of mankind

13. **Ms. Gordon** (Jamaica) introduced draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.23/Rev.1 on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, and drew attention to some minor editing changes in paragraph 2.

14. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested on paragraph 7.

15. **Mr. Kotis** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation had called for a vote and was opposed to paragraph 7. The continued diversion of resources from the regular budget of the United Nations to subsidize independent and self-sustaining treaty bodies such as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change was disappointing. As a matter of principle, treaty bodies could and should collect the necessary funds from their membership to finance their activities. The United States supported the objectives of the Framework Convention and would continue to do so through voluntary contributions.

16. **Mr. Sunaga** (Japan) said that his delegation would vote against the paragraph. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change had its own budget and its own secretariat. As not all States Members of the United Nations were parties to the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, the cost of conference-servicing should not be charged against the regular budget of the United Nations. The United Nations could continue to provide quality and cost-efficient conference-servicing to the Framework Convention but such services should no longer be provided free of charge.

17. *At the request of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.23/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab

Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Japan, Somalia, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Israel, Kazakhstan.

18. *Paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.23/Rev.1 was adopted by 158 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.**

19. **The Chairman** invited Committee members to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.23/Rev. 1 as a whole.

20. **Ms. Walpole** (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of position on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union, while ready to join the consensus on the draft resolution as a whole, was disappointed that it did not reflect important decisions on climate change, agreed at the highest possible level at the start of the current session. She expressed satisfaction at the important outcomes of the eleventh session of the Conference of the Parties to the Framework Convention and the first session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, held recently in Montreal.

21. The European Union welcomed the adoption of the Marrakesh Accords, containing mechanisms and procedures for compliance that would allow effective implementation of the Kyoto Protocol, including flexible mechanisms. It also welcomed the decision to initiate a process to consider further commitments for Parties included in Annex I to the Convention for the period beyond 2012 in accordance with article 3, paragraph 9, of the Kyoto Protocol.

22. She expressed the European Union's satisfaction at the opening of a dialogue under the Framework Convention on long-term cooperative action to address climate change by enhancing implementation of the Convention and the adoption of the five-year programme of work on the scientific, technical and socio-economic aspects of impacts of, and vulnerability and adaptation to, climate change (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.31, para. 1).

23. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.23/Rev.1 as a whole, as orally revised, was adopted.*

24. **Mr. Kotis** (United States of America) said that, while his delegation was committed to the objectives of the Framework Convention, since the adoption of the United Nations Millennium Declaration in September 2000, the United States had made it clear that it would neither ratify the Kyoto Protocol nor engage in efforts to ensure its entry into force or implementation. The United States therefore considered the reference in the tenth preambular paragraph to be historical in nature.

(g) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.35/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on the implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa

25. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.35/Rev.1, which was being submitted by the delegation of Jamaica on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications. He noted that a delegation had requested a recorded vote on paragraph 18 of the draft resolution.

26. **Mr. Kotis** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation had requested a recorded vote because it was disappointed by the continued diversion of resources from the regular budget to subsidize independent and self-sustaining treaty bodies, such as the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification. As a matter of principle, treaty bodies could and should collect the necessary funds from their membership to finance their activities. His delegation supported the objectives of the Convention and would continue to do so through voluntary contributions.

* The delegation of Somalia subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of paragraph 7 of the draft resolution.

27. **Mr. Sunaga** (Japan) said that his delegation would vote against paragraph 18 of the draft resolution. The Convention, which had been in place almost 10 years, was an independent body with its own budget and secretariat. Moreover, not all States were party to the Convention. The cost of servicing the conference of the Convention should therefore be separate from the regular budget and the Convention should reimburse the United Nations. The cost of conference-servicing would not change unless the General Assembly denied its services to the Convention and the task was outsourced.

28. *A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 18 of the draft resolution.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Japan, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Israel.

29. *Paragraph 18 was adopted by 159 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.*

30. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.35/Rev.1 was adopted.*

31. **Mr. Kotis** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation was committed to the objectives of the Convention but stressed, with regard to paragraph 12, that Governments contributed to the Convention strictly on a voluntary basis.

Agenda item 54: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(a) Globalization and interdependence (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.12 and A/C.2/60/L. 71)

Draft resolution on role of the United Nations in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence

32. **The Chairman** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.71, which he had submitted in his capacity as Vice-Chairman, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.12. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

33. **Ms. Mammadova** (Azerbaijan), speaking as facilitator, drew attention to two minor editorial changes in paragraphs 22 and 23, respectively, adding that paragraph 19 should be deleted.

34. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.71, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

35. **Ms. Shestack** (United States of America) said that, in joining the consensus on the draft resolution, the United States understood the term "right to development" to mean that each individual should enjoy the right to develop his or her intellectual and other capabilities to the maximum extent possible through the exercise of the full range of civil and political rights.

36. **Ms. Haycock** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union attached great importance to the social dimension of globalization and was committed to internal and external policies that contributed to maximizing the benefits and minimizing the costs of globalization for all countries. It welcomed efforts to promote corporate social responsibility and encouraged the private sector to contribute to corporate social responsibility initiatives that fostered fair globalization. The European Union underlined the importance of the relationship between business sector development and pro-poor growth and was undertaking a range of initiatives to enhance the role of the private sector in development.

37. **Ms. Brown** (Canada) said that her Government attached great importance to the protection and promotion of cultural diversity. The Convention on the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions, which had been adopted at the recent General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), recognized that cultural goods and services had both an economic and a social value, and also recognized the important link between culture and development. Canada had been the first to deposit its instrument of acceptance with UNESCO and encouraged all countries to ratify the Convention. Given the broad international support for the Convention, Canada regretted the failure to reach consensus on an explicit reference to the Convention in the draft resolution.

38. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.12 was withdrawn.*

(c) International migration and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.15/Rev.1, L.16, L.62, L.70)

Draft resolution on facilitation and reduction of the cost of transfer of migrants remittances

39. **The Chairman** drew attention to draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.15/Rev.1 and informed the Committee that Italy, the Philippines and Turkey remained among the sponsors and had been joined by Argentina, Bolivia, Canada, Cape Verde, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Georgia, Guatemala, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Ukraine and Uruguay. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

40. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted.*

41. **Mr. Ceinos-Cox** (United States of America) said that his Government had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. The latter reflected the view of the international community that remittances were an important source of financing for development and recognized the need to promote cheaper and safer remittance transfers in both source and recipient countries. However, it did not actively encourage actions to ensure secure and transparent transfers to curb illegal activities such as terrorism financing nor did it actively encourage competition as a means to reduce costs and improve services. His Government encouraged countries to consider those important topics in formulating their remittance and financial services policies.

42. **Ms. Haycock** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union endorsed the draft resolution and would like to see a debate on how to increase the development impact of remittance transfers in recipient countries. As had been pointed out in General Assembly resolution 58/208, for many countries remittances by migrant workers were one of the major sources of foreign exchange.

43. The European Union agreed with the resolution text itself and was firmly convinced that future discussions on remittances should address measures and factors to reduce costs and strengthening of the existing national systems of remittance data collection. It looked forward to addressing those aspects at the upcoming High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development.

44. **Ms. Brown** (Canada) said that her Government aligned itself with the explanation of position given by the European Union.

45. **Mr. Mbayu** (Cameroon) said that his delegation had wished to join the sponsorship.

Draft resolutions on international migration and development

46. **The Chairman** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.62 which he had submitted in his capacity as Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.16, adding that the programme budget implications were contained in document A/C.2/60/L.70. He read out a number of corrections to the draft resolution.

47. **Ms. Ryder** (Switzerland) said that her delegation would like to introduce ",within existing resources" at the end of paragraph 7.

48. **The Chairman** said that, if no objections were raised, he would take it that the Committee wished to accept paragraph 7, as orally amended.

49. *It was so decided.*

50. **The Chairman** informed the Committee that Belarus had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

51. **Mr. Seth** (Secretary of the Committee) replying to a question from **Mr. Ceinos-Cox** (United States of America) said that the budgetary impact of the amendment to paragraph 7 would have to be analysed. If any changes were required by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) and the Fifth Committee, they would be reflected in a revised statement of programme budget implications.

52. **Mr. Ceinos-Cox** (United States of America) said that, under rule 153, his delegation requested a new programme of budgetary implications based on paragraph 7, as orally amended.

53. **The Chairman** said that action on the draft resolution would be postponed pending consideration of the programme budget implications by the Advisory Committee.

54. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 55: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(a) Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.32/Rev.1, L.52 and L.69)

Draft resolution on the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries: high-level meeting on the midterm comprehensive global review of the implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010

55. **The Chairman** drew attention to the programme budget implications which were contained in document A/C.2/60/L.52.

56. **Mr. Cannell** (United Kingdom) proposed that paragraph 6 of the draft resolution should be replaced by the text contained in document A/C.2/60/L.69. It had been carefully formulated to take into account the concerns of other delegations and was the fifth compromise proposal submitted by the European Union.

57. **Ms. Gordon** (Jamaica), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that she could not accept the proposed amendment or any further amendments to the text which had been the subject of extensive negotiations.

58. **Mr. Kotis** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, stated that his delegation would vote against the proposed amendment simply because it failed to address the budgetary implications of the paragraph.

59. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposed amendment to paragraph 6.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Against:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei

Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Armenia, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Norway.

60. *The amendment was rejected by 112 votes to 45, with 5 abstentions.*

61. **Ms. Rødsmoen** (Norway) said that her delegation had abstained not because it had difficulties with the content of the amendment but because Norway supported the original draft of paragraph 6 as submitted by the Group of 77 and China.

62. **Mr. Kotis** (United States of America) asked for a vote on paragraph 6. Speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, he said that his delegation would vote against the paragraph. The least developed countries, more than any other group, were confronted by poverty and obstacles to achieving the Millennium Development Goals and therefore rightly received special attention as part of poverty eradication efforts in the United Nations system. The proposed review had a budgetary implication of nearly $800,000, not counting the travel and accommodation expenses of delegates, and surpassed the proposed budget by $254,000. Those expenses could have been reduced substantially with proper planning and judicious implementation of General Assembly resolution 57/270 B, particularly its provisions that emphasized making use of existing United Nations mechanisms.

63. *A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 6.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea,

Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

64. *Paragraph 6 was adopted by 117 votes to 1, with 45 abstentions.*

65. **Mr. Cannell** (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote, said that the European Union had abstained. The European Union remained fully committed to the review of the Programme of Action as part of a wider global environment agenda and to General Assembly resolution 57/270 B and looked forward to a midterm review that would identify areas where progress was possible. In the previous year's resolution the international community had committed itself to outlining the modalities of such a review. The international community should clearly identify the objectives of the review before the review was undertaken; paragraph 6 did not do so. The European Union was also concerned over the programme budget implications of paragraphs 5 and 6 and wished to ensure that the predicted costs were either essential or could not be absorbed within existing resources. It was disturbing that, within a programme founded on partnership, the European Union's partners could not consider its concerns.

66. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.32/Rev.1, was adopted.*

67. **Mr. Ceinos-Cox** (United States of America), explaining his country's position, said that during the negotiations his delegation had shown much flexibility regarding the timing, duration, dates and structure of the review mandate. However, the Group of 77 had acted in a high-handed and irresponsible manner and had created an unfortunate precedent by breaking the traditional consensus on the issue of least developed countries. The budgetary implications of the review came to nearly $800,000; those funds would not contribute to the eradication of poverty.

68. Moreover, a negotiated outcome of the proposed review would necessitate a wasteful and time consuming procedure and would distract from a serious assessment of the progress made under the Programme of Action. The latter would be considered the following year by the Economic and Social Council and by the General Assembly. As both of those bodies could be expected to produce negotiated texts on the least developed countries, there was little need for a third negotiated text on the same subject. The United States would be willing to participate in the negotiation of a short declaration recommitting Member States to the goals and objectives of the Programme of Action. Lastly, regarding paragraph 7, although the Bretton Woods institutions should play a role in the Programme of Action, they had their own governing bodies and it was inappropriate for the General Assembly to direct an unnamed entity of the United Nations system to coordinate their preparation for the review.

69. **Mr. Sunaga** (Japan) said that even though paragraphs 5 and 6 did not contain the phrase "within existing resources", his delegation had joined the consensus because partnership with the least developed countries was of great importance to Japan. It expected the Secretariat to implement the budget as effectively as possible.

70. **Mr. Zerangourou** (Benin), speaking on behalf of the Coordination Bureau of Least Developed Countries, chaired by his country, underscored the significance of all contributions to a better implementation of the Programme of Action.

71. **Ms. Mills** (Jamaica), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus but regretted that a vote had been necessary on the implementation of the Programme of Action and resented having been described as high-handed in negotiations despite the flexibility that it had shown with regard to many amendments.

(b) Specific actions related to the particular needs and problems of landlocked developing countries: outcome of the International Ministerial Conference of Landlocked and Transit Developing Countries and Donor Countries and International Financial and Development Institutions on Transit Transport Cooperation (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.33 and A/C.2/60/L.68)

Draft resolution on specific actions related to the particular needs and problems of landlocked developing countries: outcome of the International Ministerial Conference of Landlocked and Transit Developing Countries and Donor Countries and International Financial and Development Institutions on Transit Transport Cooperation

72. **The Chairman** drew attention to draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.68, submitted by Mr. Alshabibi (Yemen), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.33.

73. **Mr. Seth** (Secretary of the Committee), referring to paragraph 15, said that provision had been made in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 for implementing the terms of the draft resolution. Therefore, should the Committee adopt the draft resolution, no additional appropriation would be required.

74. **Mr. Sunaga** (Japan), speaking as facilitator of the draft resolution, drew attention to a number of minor editorial changes.

75. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.68, as orally revised, was adopted.*

76. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.33 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 59: Towards global partnerships (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.38/Rev.1)

Draft resolution towards global partnerships

77. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.38/Rev.1, adding that it had no programme budget implications. The delegations of Albania, Belarus, Bolivia, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Japan, Madagascar, Mali, the Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Somalia, Switzerland, Ukraine and Uruguay had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

78. **Mr. Fonseca** (Brazil) drew attention to two minor editorial changes.

79. **Mr. Cremades** (Spain) said that three revisions should be made to the Spanish text of the draft resolution. In the last preambular paragraph and in paragraph 14, the phrase "non-public" in the English text should be rendered "*no públicos*" in the Spanish text rather than "*no gubernamentales*" and "*no estatales*", respectively. In paragraph 5, the word "*asociaciones*" should be replaced by the word "*organizaciones*".

80. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.38/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

81. **Mr. Mally** (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the resolution because it strongly supported efforts by the United Nations to make greater use of partnerships, in particular public-private partnerships, in carrying out its activities. Enhancing cooperation between the United Nations and the private sector, civil society and non-governmental organizations would greatly increase the efficiency of the Organization s work. In that context, his delegation interpreted references to "partnerships" throughout the draft resolution as referring to partnerships between the United Nations and all relevant partners.

82. His Government, in an effort to support good corporate citizenship, made annual awards to firms that set positive examples in that regard. Corporate responsibility should, however, be placed in its proper context. A firm's principal responsibility was to those with whom it had a contractual or business relationship and its principal function was to produce and sell goods and services. In doing so, it provided public benefits in the form of healthy economies, jobs, income, goods, services, skills, capital or technology. Governments, meanwhile, should accept their responsibility to put in place an appropriate framework for economic activity and the protection of human rights. Political and social agendas that were the responsibility of governments must not be shifted to businesses under the guise of corporate responsibility initiatives.

83. **Mr. Blake** (Jamaica), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group of 77 and China had shown flexibility in the effort to reach consensus but regretted that no agreement had been reached on provisions concerning the important issue of corporate social responsibility.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.